

Sati Shankar orcid.org/0000-0003-4638-1745	satigsf@gmail.com www.satishankar.in
Sheldon Pollock & the Sanskrit Knowledge System: Some observations	Unit- F Ver.- o : Date 02/ 06/2016
Draft version not to be quoted without permission	© Global Synergetic Foundation

Sheldon Pollock & the Sanskrit Knowledge System: Some observations

Sati Shankar*

Global Synergetic Foundation, New Delhi, India

(1) Introduction

Scholarship can be counteracted only through scholarship. To defend our tradition, true scholarship is the only instrument supplemented by the strong movement for popularization. There is no end of journalistic dogfights and propagandist's ventures where one, who has better 'paraphernalia' wins. Why we face a dilemma is clearly stated by Ananda Coomaraswamy. He says, "On the one hand, the professional scholar, who has direct access to the sources, functions in isolation; on the other, the amateur propagandist of Indian thought disseminates mistaken notions. Between the two, no provision is made for the educated man of good will." [Coomaraswamy. 1994, viii]. This truly represents our case. The claims made by Prof. Sheldon Pollock in relation to Sanskrit Knowledge System, [SKS, 2013], and the concerns raised in 'The Battle For Sanskrit' [Malhotra. 2016], has made it necessary to make a careful and critical scholarly evaluation of the claims made and take stock of the situation to visualize clearly the state of affair and devise some "strategy" to counter and to reach at least to zero-sum initially. Further, To defeat an inquiry and its resultant theories one must be able to scrutinize and hit the fundamental assumptions underlying the methods and its theories used, then and only then, we can hope to take a position. Once this is position is taken, a single hit would be able to demolish a series of applications. Therefore, we must do a *purva paksha* not only of applications, like translations for errors but on methodologies and theories of analytics employed by Western and Westernized Indian scholars. We aim here to *purva paksha* on Prof. Pollock's Methodologies. We are interested in digging out the presuppositions and "intent factors", in various hypotheses Prof. Pollock makes and the way they are proved or disproved or silently bypassed, norms of making choices in selecting texts, their timings and issues like that, the levels of their compatibility and adaptability and of generalizability, of findings, if any, over whole SKS and hence, by implication, our tradition.

Within the confines of the objective of "*purva paksha*", this paper has five parts. The first, which you are currently reading, begins with an introduction to the historicity and forms of knowledge in Indian tradition and some basic concepts in philology as a necessary background and some signatures on their applicability. The second part makes a brief survey of Pollock's methodological paradigms in SKS and research design, assumptions, hypotheses etc. Part three, presents a sample of how Pollock analyses the raw textual data, compares the texts in genre, substance, and ideas that texts carry to reach a conclusion or at least to establish a causal link which fits to the paradigm he adopts for SKS where he attempts for de-sacralization of Sanskrit and interpret it as instrument for power-culture game.. We focus on a lecture delivered by Prof. Pollock, as Twelfth Gonda Lecture, on Dec.3rd, 2004, before the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, [Pollock. 2005]. We are able to see vividly here how and why the conceptual filtering are used to reach a conclusion. We are able to judge whether the selection of text, genre, and their spatiotemporal traits and representation are sufficient to generalize the results so obtained to the whole of SKS.

Prof. Pollock has been a prolific writer with one of the most powerful, if not effective 'paraphernalia'. His language is famed to be terse and metaphorical, and his style, logically circular, repetitive and occasionally self-contradicting. Prof. Pollock's work is aimed at, not-so-unbiased deconstruction via philological and historiographical analysis of Sanskrit literature, which represents the 'heart and soul' of our tradition, which makes the issue very sensitive for us for various reasons as lucidly explained in [Malhotra, 2016]. These techniques are humanistic in nature where full technological analytics is never sufficient, human interference is indispensable and therefore, human error becomes obvious and unavoidable. It is well accepted worldwide that conclusions drawn based on textual substance are limited by the 'limits of their translations', [Sati Shankar, 2015] unless interpreted within their own tradition and according to the standards set by the tradition itself their reliability remains questionable. These aspects are dealt with in the fourth part along with some strategic way forward and while doing so proposal has been made to deepen the technical side to assimilate the facts and reality with respect to the standards set out by the Indian tradition itself, [Sati Shankar. 2015, a]. That is the way we can take a position to guard our tradition in the true sense of scholarship. Part five is for notes and reference. Finally, my standpoint and approach here shall be as a scientific-indifferent-academic.

(1.1) Historicity and Forms of Knowledge in Indian Tradition

In 1949, in his UNESCO essay, Prof. B.L. Atreya wrote "The Vedic way, the way of constant spiritual interpretation ... leads to life ... the life which is self-perpetuating self-renewing, and which for the individual and for the world may be eternal."..."Unlike other (traditions), it did not die ... that which in it was vital and true cast off the old shell and clothes itself in more suitable expression, with no break in the continuity of life and no loss of the sanctity and weight of its authority." [Atreya 1949. p9]. When imagined with respect to time, *kāla* to be specific and not be confused with the physical space-time, Indian tradition, being

Sati Shankar orcid.org/0000-0003-4638-1745	satigsf@gmail.com www.satishankar.in
Sheldon Pollock & the Sanskrit Knowledge System: Some observations	Unit- F Ver.- o : Date 02/ 06/2016
Draft version not to be quoted without permission	© Global Synergetic Foundation

holistic in view, follows cyclical process of *yuga* and of evolution, where, remarkably, one cannot happen without the other, being the facets of same 'One' and hence no linear historicity and without a full stop. Indian and Western scholars including historians, Indologists, orientalist, and historians of literature, one of whom we are to consider in what follows, have been divided in their opinion about the historical sense of the ancient Indians. It has been said that the Indians had no sense of history and chronology. A.A Macdonell calls it a "defect". He says "The total lack of the historical sense is so characteristic, that the whole course of Sanskrit literature is darkened by the shadow of this defect ... Early India wrote no history because it never made any" [Macdonell 1900, *quoted in* Pollock. 2008]. Pollock [2005] finds this attitude, (of no historicity) problematic for many reasons. He writes, "Absence of Indian history. *die Geschichte*, assuming for sake of argument that is absent, does not entail the absence of Indian history, *das Feschehen*, assuming for the sake of argument that this is what we see, does not preclude the possibility of a history, *die Geschichte*." He puts further, "The unhistorical has historicity, and the cyclical itself presupposes it; even demonstrating stasis and repetition requires historiography. There is no insuperable contradiction between a historical and a historic reconstruction of the world less committed to history than the modern West; we can still take seriously what they took seriously, as I once put it, and take it historically, whether they took it historically or even unhistorically."

Pollock took up an 'A historiographical project, [SKS, 2013], 'Sanskrit Knowledge Systems on the Eve of Colonialism,' confronted with the "question of Indian intellectual history, and the theories and methods that may be specific to it, in an unavoidable, even dramatic, manner,' aimed to write a history of Sanskrit for a time-space of "late premodern" or "early modern" period (c.1550-1750). 'taking terms in a strictly "chronological" and "value-neutral" sense as virtually synonymous with pre-colonial'." He 'believes' that the ' assertion of cyclical renewal are in fact *false generalization* about premodern Indian beliefs-seventeenth century scholars could provide a very linear account indeed of their disciplines when they wished to do so.' He notes, "Even if these assertions were true it would mean that we can never know anything about traditional India but what traditional Indians themselves know. To abandon historical analysis in the name what some emphatically call "difference" would be like abandoning the heliocentric theory of geocentrism ... It is entirely possible for us to learn about premodern processes, even processes involving meaning and historicity, that premodern people did not reflect upon the same way we do today." [Pollock. 1989]. On contrary, we find our position 'misrepresented and misinterpreted', and his interpretations quite 'uninformed' of true Indian tradition' and methodologically not so 'neutral' as claimed.

(1.2). Philology as Theory and Method

Since Pollock's works are for SKS, and what he calls, "boring task of excavating" the "data", we are concerned with discourses and textual analysis. The textual analysis should be viewed as a form of discourse analysis'. The concept of discourse refers to "language, carrying ideas, as social practice determined by social structures" That is why it is also argued that "discourse shapes or produces social structures, as well as being determined by them". Discourse is often associated with forms of order and institutions and traditions. There are different methods of text analysis, some of which are incompatible with each other and produce different types of information. *So there is no single "correct" method of text-analysis, but many methods.* As it is the case with other forms of qualitative and quantitative methods of research, our choice of method should be determined by your research question and the aim of our research undertaking. Pollock says, 'What I offer instead as a rough-and-ready working definition at the same time embodies a kind of program, even a challenge: His method, 'philology is, or should be, the discipline of making sense of texts.' He says, 'It is not the theory of language—that's linguistics— or the theory of meaning or truth—that's philosophy—but the theory of textuality as well as the history of textualized meaning. [Pollock, 2009]. We base this section on [Pollock, 2009, 2011, 2014] and

[Jha, *undated*.], for brevity we present this section through pointers. 'The theory and method in philology are generally not separable.' Philology is by nature multidimensional like the human affairs, so it is plurastic. Its techniques act through textual analysis and thereby capable of finely dissecting the various dimensions and underlying causal chains of the processes. For a recent introduction, see e.g., [Turner, 2014].

It is said that a text is a compromise between the author and the reader. While applying to a text for interpretation, Pollock delineates three sets of meanings,

- (i) author's meaning,
- (ii) tradition's meaning,
- (iii) textual meaning as recognized by the reader, i.e., contextual meaning, philologists' meaning. (present)

Of these, it is the philologist's historical reading of the text for meaning is philology. A text can tell more about its own historical time than any other. There is no potentially trans-historical dimension to the meaning of any historical text. This makes present of the philologist irrelevant so far as the meaning of the text is concerned and hence the text is itself assumed to be outside of 'history'. Pollock does not reject the historicist meaning. 'In fact, it provides the choice of object: the text; and a form of historical knowledge emerges as philology's directedness towards the past,' thus it can come up as central to what Prof. Pollock calls, 'the future philology'. The present of the philologist is, in fact, the third of the three sources of meanings that together constitute philology. To him, the presentist reading is our own meaning of the text. He uses Gadamer's conception, 'We write the kind of past we write because of the kind of present we inhabit and the kind of future we desire.'

Sati Shankar orcid.org/0000-0003-4638-1745	satigsf@gmail.com www.satishankar.in
Sheldon Pollock & the Sanskrit Knowledge System: Some observations	Unit- F Ver.- o : Date 02/ 06/2016
Draft version not to be quoted without permission	© Global Synergetic Foundation

Spinoza's philology was the philology of the capitalist age and Prof. Pollock pleads for a post-capitalist philology with a kind of new species consciousness. 'We need a global, pluralist philology,' he demands, however, Pollock is very clear that a 'the deeper meaning' of the text, cannot be assured lest aside the 'only true meaning'. Between the historicist and the presentist meaning, is the 'traditional meaning'. The tradition is another kind of 'true meaning' for Pollock and he accepts that 'none of these interpretations is false'. 'All interpretations are embodiments of human consciousness called into being by certain properties of the text and it cannot be called correct or incorrect in their historical existence. We have to ask what there is in the text that calls those interpretations into being'. Pollock puts 'the text' as prior to all interpretations. These three dimensions of meaning do not have to come together or hang together in Pollock's view. Pollock takes a broadly 'pragmatic' view on the question of truth or 'true meaning'. Philology has to work within this triadic structure of meaning. All the human dimensions, which can be imagined, can be made dimensions of philology, and we must accept, all may be prone to human error by its very nature.

(1.3) Texts and Knowledge Traditions

Pollock finds writing Indian Intellectual history is justified, necessary and easy, but its interpretation far more complex. The complexity has two sources:

- (1) 'our own context which we cannot suppress since it is part of the historiographical venture itself.
- (2) 'our context' is itself complex,

Pollock, is interested in the dimension, what he calls the 'power-culture order.'

There is an inherent tension in his scheme of what he calls the scientific, pluralist philology. It is between "meaning depending on the context" and the possible 'true meaning'.

There are some other sources of tensions, [Jha, *undated*], noted here with a view that they might be helpful in *Uttar paksha*.

- (a) 'The historicist conviction of access to a meaning is located in the 'present' of the researcher, significantly constituted by a tradition of scientific philology.'
- (b) 'It is because the researcher is approaching its subject, the text, from within a research tradition, and seeks to discover that 'text' of the real which is beyond all culturally produced texts.
- (c) 'In Pollock's scheme, just as in the scientific tradition itself, the tradition of inquiry to which researcher himself or herself belongs, becomes invisible. This tradition regards itself as 'non-traditional' or 'anti-traditional'.
- (d) 'A knowledge tradition marks the presence of an 'absolute meaning', in the form of a set of practices or a form of life. Therefore, while Pollock rejects the historicist philology's exemption of itself from being 'in history', he does not note its exemption from tradition.'
- (e) 'Texts are traces of knowledge traditions. In fact, a text is the intersection of several knowledge traditions. *For example, a text of Buddhist philosophy will be part of textual, literary, philosophical, meditational traditions.*'
- (f) 'How a text is understood in a tradition depends on how the text is 'used' or read, or which is the same thing, how the text is 'read' in that tradition.'
- (g) 'If one wants to relate a text to a context outside of it, the first step is to look at how the text is used or read. This knowledge of how the text is 'used' does not come from the knowledge of the text. It can only come from the knowledge of the tradition to which that text belongs.'
- (h) 'When a philologist reads a text from a distant past culture, we can say that two knowledge traditions are potentially in contact. But we cannot know the knowledge tradition only by our reading the text, we will have to know how the text was used and why it was so used.'
- (i) 'In newer translations of texts from Indian philosophical tradition, there is a move away from 'philological' to more 'philosophical' translations.'

(3) Pollock's Research Design

Our study in this section is based on [Dunkin. 2013]. He developed a systematic critique, especially on side relating to colonialism and Cosmopolis in Pollock's massive project [SKS, 2013]. Based on his analysis, [Dunkin. 2013], argues 'that the "absence" of a "theory of cultural difference" undercuts some of the important insights Pollock's work offers about pre-modern South Asian culture. It also claims that the changes brought about by colonialism, "without an appropriate theory of culture and cultural change", are comparatively insignificant in understanding colonialism's devastating impact on India.' For ease of understanding let us approach [Dunkin. 2013] by considering his conclusion first. In conclusion, he writes,

- (i) 'When one excavates the pre-colonial Indian data without a theory, the result looks somewhat like Pollock's *The Language of the Gods...* [Pollock, 2006].'
- (ii) 'It has seemingly refreshing insights on the Indian past. But, and this is the reason why I say 'seemingly', it is not clear what the importance or the implications of these insights are.'

Sati Shankar orcid.org/0000-0003-4638-1745	satigsf@gmail.com www.satishankar.in
Sheldon Pollock & the Sanskrit Knowledge System: Some observations	Unit- F Ver.- o : Date 02/ 06/2016
Draft version not to be quoted without permission	© Global Synergetic Foundation

(iii) ' Consider the insight from Pollock mentioned earlier (here we see below), that “[n]o uniform code of law was ever enforced anywhere across caste groupings, let alone everywhere in an imperial polity” [Pollock, 2006: 277].

If this is true, it is possible that castes were never seen as one unit (as a social system, that is), as we so conveniently portray them in the present.'

(iv) ' If a uniform code of law was never enforced across caste and an imperial polity, either no restrictions or rules were ever enforced across caste and a 'state' ("imperial polity") or such restrictions were enforced through other modes.

(v) 'Pollock fails to see such implications of his own insight, and argues that,

“[f]rom around the beginning of the first millennium B.C.E., when the earliest form of Sanskrit appeared in South Asia, until around the beginning of the first millennium C.E., Sanskrit...was restricted both in terms of who was permitted to make use of the language and which purposes the language could subserve. Access to Sanskrit was reserved for particular orders of society, and it was employed predominantly in connection with the liturgy of the Vedic ritual and associated knowledge systems such as grammar, phonetics, and metrics” [Pollock, 2006: 39].

(vi) 'It looks miraculous that two-thousand-years ago, with the kind of transportation and communication media available at that time, a language was restricted to South Asia to specific castes and purposes.'

(vii) '[Pollock, 2006] is full of similar examples where he fails to see the implications of his own insights, and ends up making farfetched claims. And, in this sense, he looks more like a colonial European scholar amazed at the rich material found in India.'

(3.1) Place of Hypotheses in Research

Just to lay the better foundation in *purva paksha*, now a little on the place of hypothesis in research. The “Hourglass” notion of a research are:

- Where does the problem to be investigated originated?
- Criteria of problems and problem statement
- Goals & Planning
- Search, Explore & Gather the Evidence
- Generate creative and logical alternative solutions, Making the educated guess- the hypothesis;

and then, a hypothesis is a statement made as clearly as possible of what is intended to be investigated. It should be specified before research is conducted and openly stated. It allows us to identify the research objectives, the key abstract concepts involved and their relationships to both the problem statement and the literature review. A problem cannot be scientifically solved unless it is reduced to hypothesis form. It is a powerful tool of advancement of knowledge, consistent with existing knowledge and conducive to further inquiry. A Hypothesis can be tested, verifiable or falsifiable. It is not a moral or ethical. It is neither too specific nor too general. It is a prediction of consequences and expected a result. It is considered valuable even if proven false.

(3.2) The Hypotheses Pollock makes:

[Dunkin. 2013], points, 'Pollock himself states, [SKS, 2013] there is a hypothesis about colonialism which underlies his work and it is this hypothesis that must stand up to scrutiny for his project to be considered worthy of further examination.' Pollock's hypothesis regarding how to study colonialism's impact on India, therefore, must be examined carefully. We find that 'the hypothesis in question, is a rather blunt but thought-provoking claim': Pollock hypothesizes,

“As I have tried to argue in various forums for some fifteen years – though it will seem breathtakingly banal to frame the issue in the only way it can be framed – we cannot know how colonialism changed South Asia if we do not know what was there to be changed” [Pollock 2004: 19]. This hypothesis raises at least two difficult questions.

(1) 'How do we find out what was there in South Asia (or India) before it was colonized?

(2) How will we ever recover that which is changed or lost forever?"

The First Question: According to [Dunkin. 2013], we can see two different solutions to this problem in Pollock's work.

First Solution:

The first solution is provided by [Pollock, 2004: 19], he simply says that we need to do the “boring task of excavating” the "data" (i.e. literature and historical information -*added*). The existing interpretations of what was there in pre-colonial India, which have been “dominant since the days of Max Weber” are “derived more from assumptions than from actual assessments of data”. 'Pollock further points out that we have abundant materials to make "some sense of culture and power" in early modern India [pre-colonial India] ... South Asia boasts a literary record far denser in terms of a sheer number of texts and centuries of unbroken multilingual literacy than all of Greek and Latin and medieval European culture combined". This answer carries an "optimistic claim" but ignores the facts, as pointed by [Dunkin. 2013], which will be considered below.

Second Solution:

Pollock himself acknowledges that the current social sciences are 'Eurocentric' and are therefore not suitable to interpret pre-colonial data from India. “There is a natural tendency, exhibited even (or especially) in social and cultural theory, to generalize familiar forms of life and experience as universal tendencies and common sense” [Pollock, 2006: 259; also 19].

Sati Shankar orcid.org/0000-0003-4638-1745	satigsf@gmail.com www.satishankar.in
Sheldon Pollock & the Sanskrit Knowledge System: Some observations	Unit- F Ver.- o : Date 02/ 06/2016
Draft version not to be quoted without permission	© Global Synergetic Foundation

But surprisingly, Pollock "does not develop this point further" in his works, but, [Dunkin. 2013], 'the importance of this observation cannot be undermined since he keeps returning to this point throughout the book, though obliquely' [Pollock. 2006]. 'A restatement of the above in more accessible terms can be made.' [Dunkin. 2013], puts it as, 'There is a natural tendency in social and cultural theory, to accept ("generalize") western experience ("familiar forms of life and experience") as scientific descriptions, and as modes of understanding and living ("tendencies" and "common sense") common across cultures.' This stronger version is due to [Balagangadhara, 2005, 2012].

While knowing the influence of Euro-centricity and suggesting for "excavation of data" Pollock must have developed some methods to interpret the data. On this Pollock reasserts that, "[o]ne of the most serious conceptual impediments" in understanding South Asian culture comes from the fact that "our tools to understand it are "shaped by western exemplars."

Does it mean he employs same tools of interpretation he has been criticizing?

(3.3) The Cosmopolis and the Empire

Pollock then introduces the notion of empire, and making use of historical construction of the Roman Empire, and ends up in producing an imperfect image of "Southern Asian rAjya" [Pollock. 2006. 274]. 'We note that the practices of empire in the two worlds were as different as their principles.' [Dunkin. 2013] points,

- (1)'No imperial formation arising in the Sanskrit cosmopolis ever stationed troops to rule over conquered territories.'
- (ii)'No populations were ever enumerated.'
- (iii)'No uniform code of law was ever enforced anywhere across caste groupings, let alone everywhere in an imperial polity.'
- (iv)'No evidence indicates that transculturation was ever the route to imperial advancement in the bureaucracy or military. (277; emphasis added)'

On the contrary, points [Dunkin. 2013], Pollock continues, a "belief that it [the Roman state] was universal and willed by the gods is abundant in Latin literature and is a constituent of Roman thinking from the end of the third century B.C.E. on". However, [Dunkin. 2013], points, 'Indeed once we learn to look free from the prejudgments derived from Roman and later European experience that tends to obscure our vision, there is no cogent evidence that any remotely comparable instrumentality was attached to the numinous status of the overlord in Sanskrit cosmopolis.' Two points are worth noting in these arguments:

- (1) 'A uniform code of law was never enforced anywhere across caste groupings, let alone everywhere in an imperial polity.'
- (2) 'And, it is an Orientalist presupposition to think of pre-modern India as priest-ridden and religion-besotted.' And concludes as,

'The condition under which Pollock's hypothesis is acceptable is when the second solution is seen as a constraint on the first solution.' Which means that the first solution given by Pollock can be applicable up to the limit imposed by the presence of the second solution. 'That is since the current social sciences are problematic, we need to develop new and more sound theories of culture that provide alternative ways of excavating and interpreting the material from pre-colonial India. Only then can the excavation of this material lead to an understanding of the Indian past,' [Dunkin. 2013]. Which means until we have such a sound theory of culture, any interpretation in SKS is nothing more than a tentative conjecture. [Dunkin. 2013],

(3.4). Pollock's Method of Studying Cultures and their Sub-Sets

After hypotheses, the second issue needing serious attention is how cultures are compared. According to Pollock, a comparative study of two cultures works as "an antidote" to the unjustifiable tendency of the social sciences "to generalize familiar forms of life and experience as universal tendencies and common sense". And it does so "by demonstrating the actual particularity of these apparent universalisms" [Pollock, 2006: 259].

Surprisingly, here again, Pollock does not elaborate on his claim. Instead, he offers a comparative study of South Asia and Europe, or West and East. Hence, 'to further our argument, we have to examine his comparative study of cultures,' notes [Dunkin. 2013]. Pollock, however, keeps the concept culture as a rather stable or self-evident entity and focuses on what he calls "its subsets" [Pollock 2006: 2]. This again raises several questions and doubts, points [Dunkin. 2013] notably,

- (i) What properties make a culture into a meta-level entity, and distinguish it from its subsets?
- (ii) What are the relations between culture and its subsets?

Pollock gives no answer to these, so important for understanding his research, but remains silent, and thus, prompts us to rely upon a reconstruction of his arguments.' [Dunkin. 2013].

Sati Shankar orcid.org/0000-0003-4638-1745	satigsf@gmail.com www.satishankar.in
Sheldon Pollock & the Sanskrit Knowledge System: Some observations	Unit- F Ver.- o : Date 02/ 06/2016
Draft version not to be quoted without permission	© Global Synergetic Foundation

[Pollock, 2006] 'claims that: "rough-and-ready understandings of" culture's subsets, such as, "'culture,' 'power,' and '(pre)modernity'" have "proved adequate for organizing this [his] historical study." Further, "[t]here should be nothing problematic about using the term 'culture' to refer specifically to one of its subsets, language, and especially language in relation to literature." But he is emphatic in saying that, "[w]hat should be problematic...is claiming to know and define [the subset of culture called] 'literary'"

Therefore, [Dunkin. 2013], puts, 'to divide a culture into different subsets, to discuss whether a culture includes every element of its subsets or not, to talk about how something can include elements from two different cultures, we need, at the least, a theory of cultural differences. Pollock does not seem to have a theory of culture nor does he presuppose one that helps him solve these problems.'

In the absence of a theory, Pollock compares two cultures, He puts, "As in South Asia, the nature, control, and dissemination of literacy crucially affected the creation of vernacular European literary cultures; and, as in South Asia, literacy in western Europe had a specific history, infected by factors peculiar to that world" [Pollock 2006: 439]. 'To enumerate similarities and differences between them, he argues that except the 'factors peculiar' to South Asia and Europe the other major cultural issues like, "nature, control, and dissemination of literacy" are universal factors.'

'This means that,' for Pollock, 'the two cultures are different in any number of ways, but not culturally.' [Dunkin. 2013].

On questions, 'How will we ever arrive at the differences that make the two cultures under study two different cultures and not one? Put simply, how is Pollock so sure that he is studying two different cultures (England and Java) and not one universal culture? All that Pollock seems to be using here is either his intuitive understanding or the general common sense that England and Java (or the West and the East) are two different cultures.'

'All that we can say if we take Pollock's method seriously and excavate pre-colonial Indian literature is that Indian traditions have changed. His method of studying colonialism fails to explain anything about these changes: their nature, extent, historical reasons or reasons for attributing these changes to colonialism and not just to the passing of time. In fact, Pollock's understanding of colonialism's impact on India will categorically fail to take note of these 'absences', let alone understand them.'...The kind of changes brought about by colonialism that we can understand through Pollock's method, without an appropriate theory of culture and cultural change, are comparatively insignificant in understanding colonialism's devastating impact on India.' [Dunkin. 2013].

We see above some major methodological flaws and gaps in the very paradigm Pollock carries to establish his conclusions which give us sufficient basis to demolish his paradigm itself, lest aside, minor translations and conclusions. When confronted scholarly, scientific methods come to support with full logical force.

(4) How Pollock approaches Sanskrit Knowledge System [SKS]

No *purva paksha* will be able to prepare us to take a position unless we understand how actually the "data" is analyzed in Pollock's "boring task of excavating" the "data", and point out the spaces where interpretations diverged and to identify suitable counterfactual and counterexamples. When I started writing for this section, I had in mind to give an explanation which will be reasonably complete in itself, but just after completing the first part which is one-fifth only, I realized that it will be impossible, within confines of this paper, unless I go extremely sketchy and superficial, which may defeat its own purpose. I, therefore, decided to present only first part, as a sample, and show, synoptically and as clearly as possible how the groundwork is prepared in Pollock's studies for "culture-political power intent", which Pollock himself has confessed at various places, crept into the interpretation and how the 'conceptual filtering has been made through philological analysis. I base this section on Prof. Pollock's lengthy lecture (around 100 pages in print) delivered before the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, [Pollock. 2005] which may be referred for further details. Prof. Pollock argues 'that *kavya* was invented and, that the connection between written, literary language and political power is self-consciously and variously constructed. Consequently, the use of language in literary production is determined by a history of human choice and action, a conclusion that the author suggests has far-reaching consequences'.

'Pollock believes that it can be shown that Sanskrit *SAstra* did experience a historic rupture at the dawn of modernity', and 'The fact that the Sanskrit knowledge system ceased to be creatively cultivated, and the reason why this happened, constitute an intellectual-historical problematic of considerable interest.' [Pollock. 2005, 9]. He considers Sanskrit literature, comprising *SAstra* and *kavya*, both underwent rupture but at different times. Some of *SAstra* *Ayurveda*, forms of *vyotishSAstra*, *vAstusAstra*, *yoga* preserved their residual presence, 'But many of core components of *vyutpatti*, or Sanskrit education, including the trivium of disciplines dealing with language, discourse, and logic (*Sabda*-, *vAkya*-and *pramANa-sAstra*), did not make comeback. However, 'Sanskrit remains a stable organizing framework, though the form of knowledge it organized was far from stable.' There is an abundance of literature which discusses such things. Let us come directly to the active space:

(4.1) Episode 1

Pollock organizes his exploration around: *puruSArtha*

Sati Shankar orcid.org/0000-0003-4638-1745	satigsf@gmail.com www.satishankar.in
Sheldon Pollock & the Sanskrit Knowledge System: Some observations	Unit- F Ver.- o : Date 02/ 06/2016
Draft version not to be quoted without permission	© Global Synergetic Foundation

$puruSArtha = kAma + artha + dharma,$

which he considers the primary, historically core concepts and divides his analysis into:

- (i) *kAma*: *alankAra SAstra* and the End of Literary Theory
- (ii) *dharma*: *mimAnsA* and the End of Moral Theory
- (iii) *artha*: *rAjdharm SAstra* and the End of Political Theory
- (iv) ----- he leaves *moksha*, the supreme end aimed to attain through above three *ends*-----
- (v) Is the Pre- in Premodern the Pre-in Precolonial?

As stated above, I will take up here the first one only, as an illustration, for the rest [Pollock 2005] can be approached. The sequence itself shows cultural, moral and political death with pre-modern and pre-colonial. And to establish he begins analyzing literature during a specific period. He says that these concepts have, historically been under reconstruction but never discussed. 'The "silence" is arguably due to the fact that by then the *purushArtha* had taken on the character of common sense.' In the discourse of *rAjniti*, later authors ignored it even when it locates the whole purpose of politics, perhaps because, *rAjya*, once in the hands of the minister with power, it is supposed to lead to the fulfillment of the three ends of man.' He cites *Sankar Arya's jayamangala* commentary, where he says, 'it is the end of the king that is meant (he cites *ArthaSAstra*, 1.4.1), 'Pollock says, he sees that the political supplies a standard trope-perhaps 'the' trope- for discussion of the *purushArthas* throughout Indian intellectual history.

Pollock adds some more dimensions to the traditional definition of *puruSArtha* to include some characteristic 16th and 17th century thoughts , e.g., the domain of pleasure is not dealt with in the *kAma SAstra* and the sexual pleasure but with the *sAhitya SAstra* and signifies some dispute over the *hetu* with that in *kAma SAstra* as little was written in this domain during the period in question. He points, 'substantial production of *kAmaSAstra* texts in the vernacular is discernible in this period, but if the *brajhbASA* text, he examined is in anyway characteristic, this was largely derivative of the medieval Sanskrit discourse of *kAmasutra* and related texts.' Even less was written in the domain of Science of power (*ArthSAstra*). No significant independent text was produced on *rAjdharm SAstra* in the second millennium, with the possible exception of the *BrAhaspatya sUtra*. perhaps in the 12th century. 'Discourse on Political in Sanskrit was not entirely absent, it migrated to be absorbed completely within the larger analysis of social moral order. *dharmSAstra*, in particular, within the discourse of *rAjdharmSAstra*.' He then explores causes of its disappearance in *dharmSAstra* and finds that Only one of the major compendia *dharmAnibandhas* of 17th century which discusses it in details. He finds that it to be core concern first in *sUtras*, later *Smriti* and still later mediaeval commentaries in tradition. He refers to *mimAnsA*, especially *pUrva mimAnsA*, for moral principles and called it "foundational problematic" of the system but sees forceful revival in the period under consideration.

(4.2) Episode 2:

In 17th century literature Pollock finds:

Sanskrit sAhitya = *sAhitya SAstra* (~*kAmaSAstra*) + *rAjdharm SAstra* + *mimAnsA*

Pollock sees 'pleasure, power and moral order' in deeply interconnected and immersed in the concept of *puruSArtha*. It has been well explored by Indologists but as he points in the footnote 8 that the history of the expansion of three ends to include fourth, *moksha* has been understudied. Amarsimha, (*NAmalingAnuSAsana* 2.7.58), of the 5th century, knew it but origin still unclear and Pollock tries to find its origin in *mimAnsA*. He concluded, "The world of late premodern Indian knowledge is vast, and finding some way to narrow it down is essential. I do that here by choosing 'what seems to me' to be representative persons and environments. Regional formations of epoch show divers modes of political organization and hence of patronage structures." [Pollock 2005.12].

(4.3) Episode 3:

Sanskrit sAhitya = *kAvya* + *SAstra*

To get the sense from the state of the literary theory of 16th and 17th century Pollock considers two questions:

- (i) what are the "cause", *hetu*, or factors in the creation of *kAvya*
- (ii) the nature of '*rasa*', the emotional state in literature.

Beginning with two texts, both of which concerned with the *kAvyaprakAS* of MammaTa; one by *kamalAkara* which is actual commentary and the other by *rAjachUDamani*, which was an adoption of MammaTa's work. He 'finds' that the recent editions of *kAvyadarapaNa* and *kamalAkari* flawed and suggests 1926 version must be studied alongside.

Sati Shankar orcid.org/0000-0003-4638-1745	satigsf@gmail.com www.satishankar.in
Sheldon Pollock & the Sanskrit Knowledge System: Some observations	Unit- F Ver.- o : Date 02/ 06/2016
Draft version not to be quoted without permission	© Global Synergetic Foundation

He divides literary genre into three:

Genre in *Sanskrit sAhitya* = *prakaraNa* (or Independent treatises, which were rare)
+ *alankAra SAstra* (which was adoption)
+ *kAvya* (commentary, most important part)

Genre in <i>Sanskrit sAhitya</i>		
<i>prakaraNa</i> Independent treatises	<i>alankAra SAstra</i> adoption	<i>kAvya</i> commentary
comparatively rare, only handful are well known today., including <i>Jagannatha's RasagangAdhara</i> (c 1640, Delhi) and <i>ViSveSvara's AlankArakaustubha</i> (1675.) Even specialists were unaware , which includes <i>ViSvanAth dev's SahityasudhAsindhu</i> (before 1604, Varanasi) and <i>GoKulanAtha UpAdhyAya's RasamahArNava</i> , (1675, Mithila, Varanasi). [Pollock. 2005]	More common genre, peculiar to <i>alankAraSAstra</i> - adoption, sometimes unacknowledged but usually obvious... KuvalyAnanda (based on Jaydevva's Chandraloka) of Appay DIXita, 1550., KAvyavilAsa of Ramadev ChiranjIva bhattachAryA (1720, Dhaka,) [Pollock. 2005]	More important of these <i>kAvyas</i> were the genres, was the commentary, which enjoyed the privileged place in European scholastic tradition. Not only the <i>AlankAraSAstra</i> but also <i>rAjdharma</i> discourse and in <i>mimAnsA</i> , but it had a special logic in the first of these logic systems. The development of <i>AlankAraSAstra</i> as a discipline was shaped from the start by the absence of a foundation text (Bharata's third or fourth century <i>NAtyaSAstra</i> , never occupied this position except in the discourse on <i>rasa</i> . [Pollock. 2005]

Pollock make intensive and careful comparative study of the texts is structure and genre. He says, "it is no easy thing to determine what is new, whether in method or substance, in the works of either *KamalAkara* or *RAjchudAmaNi DIXita*, since the ability to securely identify an innovation presupposes familiarity with the entire antecedent history of the discipline. We can, however, get some sense of what is typical in their intellectual projects by examining the two central problems in *alankAraSAstra* ... the account of the causal factors of poetry and the treatment of the nature of *rasa*."

He looks for *hetu* in *MammaTa*.

KAvyaprakAsh 1.3: Shaktir nipuNatAlokaSAstralAvyAdyavekshanAt / kAvyajnaSikshayAbhyAsa iti hetus yadudbhave//

According to *MammaTa*, the causal factor or *hetu* in coming into being are of *kAvya* are:

- (i) *shakti* also was known as *pratibha* ~ talent, inspiration
- (ii) *nipuNata* ~ learning, life experience
- (iii) *abhyAs* ~training

Controversy begins as to whether each of these factors cause independently or form a composite cause. *KamalAkara* explains the three elements together form a composite cause and this has been the position of the theorists since the 7th century and *DaNDin*, who presents these three as constituting a single unified cause. Point to note is that *DaNDin*'s list of causal factors, (*naisargiki cha pratibha* , *Srutam* *Srutam ch bahu nirmalam*, *amandaS cAbhiyogah*, *KavyAdarSa*, 1.103), and the various challenges to him, offered in *VAgbhata* and others. was ignored by late-medieval commentators on the *KavyaprakASa*. Thus according to Pollock, comparative textual analysis with respect to context and substance, makes it possible to identify the shifts in emphasis and its various resultants.

(4.4) Episode 4:

Temporal catagorization of scholars:

Sanskrit scholars, *vidvAn* = *prAchya* & *navya*

For *hetu* which cause *kAvya*, Pollock finds a conflict between old, *prAchya* and *navya* scholars. *KamalAkara*, here as *prAchya*, cites a verse where *pratibha* is the *hetu* of the creation of a *kAvya*, *nipuNta* is the cause of its beauty being fully achieved, *abhividdhi*. *KamalAkara* cites the case of a child who creates *kAvya* before he is *nipuNa*, i.e., before he is trained, and it is solely due to *pratibha*. In this case, *hetu* other than *pratibha* must be considered to be innate, *antarnihit*, learned in past life, before this birth.

Sati Shankar orcid.org/0000-0003-4638-1745	satigsf@gmail.com www.satishankar.in
Sheldon Pollock & the Sanskrit Knowledge System: Some observations	Unit- F Ver.- o : Date 02/ 06/2016
Draft version not to be quoted without permission	© Global Synergetic Foundation

The *navya* scholars dispute the case of a child genius." In any case, they say, a multiplicity of causes cannot be definitely proved, that is why MammTa speak of the cause on a singular,- (*hetur na tu hetavah*). According to *navya* poets, *pratibha* must be the cause and not the other two; hence it is possible to make sense of MammTa's expression *Saktih kavitva-bij-rupah sanskAraviSeSah. talent is the supreme* (*-rupa*) seed of one's being a poet,' KamlAkar for his part accepts the totality of the three constitute the cause. [Pollock. 2005, footnote 24]. "RAjchuNamani DIxita agrees with KamalAkar that the three factors must combine to produce a poem and for being capable of manifesting *rasa*.; 'When disaggregated, none can function as an independent cause. In MammaTa's definition of poetry with composite *hetu*. are free for *SabdArta doSa* as *pratibha* causes absence of *doingSa*, such as *SabdArtha doSa*, the *nipuNata* cause of its form, *sahunau* and *abhyAsa* cause capacity to manifest *rasa*.

navya scholars say that *Sakti* is the sole *hetu* of *kAvya* and not the two, and *Dimbha* can produce *kAvya* in absence of the later two and while explaining MammaTa they refer his composite cause, as the only cause, as one, and without any disintegration. The explain it as "exceptional seed of poet-hood," following "grammarian's suffix for *rupa*.

The sole causal factor in poetry is an inspiration, *pratibha* and the causal factor behind *pratibha*, Pollock points, 'is either the transcendental element produced by such things as the grace of God or great personage or exceptional learning and training... The causal factor is not. however, this group of three as a whole, Inspiration can arise even without those other two factors and solely from the grace of a great personage, as in the case of gifted child,' the important point is, when Pollock says," here one must not conjecture that the other two must have occurred in the previous birth since such an argument lacks... empirical proof, whereas, the effect can otherwise be explained." For the same logic, one cannot say it caused by some transcendental element. Thus come a place to inject the element of *de-sacralization* of Sanskrit literature based on empiricist logic.

Above the whole illustration is meant to clarify for *purva paksha*, that we have to note carefully how Prof. Pollock struggles, while applying the philology to the literature, with the causal chain, context, substance, emergence, and extinction of meanings and concepts and grammatical supplementations.

(4.5) Episode 5:

rasa:

'The problem of *rasa* is more precisely the problem on a number of *rasas*.' With the works of Anandavardhan, mid 9th century, and with the introduction of *dhvani*, as 'the linguistic mechanism of *rasa*, these came a paradigm shift but the most important aspect in the Sanskrit literature, the *alankAraSAstra* was left untouched. What came to be more important was the 'shifting of analytic focus from the process of creation of *rasa* in the literature, to that of its reception.[Pollock,1998a]. The Social aesthetics, which began with Bharata's *nAtyaSAstra*, became fully transparent especially with the works of Ksemendra (c.1050), who focused on the idea of *auchitya*, which Pollock defines as, 'a state of being in accordance with the nature of the person or thing,' which Ksemendra announced the very 'life force', *jiva*, of *rasa*. Even Anandavardhana and Bhoja had accepted it but implicitly. It was pledged that,' any traditional story should be revised, if necessary, in order to accord with the social proprieties, i.e., *auchitya*.[Pollock, 2005, 27].

auchityavuchAracharacha:v.7., *uchitam prAhurAchAryahsadriSamkilayasya yad/uchitasya ch yo bhAvas tadauchityamprachakSate//*

Thus we see " *auchitya*" of a literature takes a fore seat. Pollock quotes, [Pollock 2005, 28], Abhinavgupta: 'if the interests of cast and family were not thereby to be achieved, sexual desire must not be represented at all because it does not lead to the fulfillment of the ends of man.' the doctrine of *pratisansAryatitva*. Pollock points, 'by the time of JagannAtha, Sanskrit literature had been prohibited... from in any way surprising the reader.' He points further, 'the theory of aesthetic sentiment, too, had become transformed into a theory of 'aesthetic moralism.' "To produce authentic *rasa*, the literary text must reproduce knowledge of the dominant moral order." Exploring further the *rasa* further, the *rasa*, concerned to immoral acts by the 'social order', *rasabhASA*, were suggested either be suppressed or not presented at all. A very significant thread which Pollock seems to use while hypothesizing the culture-power processes. For example, Pollock writes, 'If *rasa* is a way of speaking about literary promulgation of an ideal - typical social order, *rasabhASA*, "rasa in appearance only", which had earlier been seen as essential component of literature, (there could be no *RAmAyana* without *RAvana*'s love for *Sita*), seems now viewed not as necessary complement- something required to compete that ideal type but as the literary promulgation of an immoral order against which theory imposed increasingly harsh strictures.' [Pollock, 2005, 29].

Pollock points to two counter developments and tries to establish how innovativeness is suppressed in Indian tradition, 'both of them framed as taxonomical problems concerning the number of *rasas*. Bhoja had already dealt with it as multiple *rasas*. Here one concerns to the '*ur-prabhAva*'. *SringAra rasa* distinguished from passion or erotic. *sringAra rasa* applied to *bhakti rasa*, religious devotion employed as a paradigm of *bhAva*. Pollock notes that 'both KamalAkara and RAjchudAmaNi DIxit, had the chance in their treatment of *KAvyaprakASA* .4.29, to challenge the idea that *rasa* was limited in number but did not do.' Both remained silent on *bhakti rasa*, 'a "silence" that is even stronger reaffirmation than the denial. JagannAtha voiced it. 'the

Sati Shankar orcid.org/0000-0003-4638-1745	satigsf@gmail.com www.satishankar.in
Sheldon Pollock & the Sanskrit Knowledge System: Some observations	Unit- F Ver.- o : Date 02/ 06/2016
Draft version not to be quoted without permission	© Global Synergetic Foundation

enumeration of *rasa* as nine, which is required by the declaration of the sage Bharata, would be violated by the inclusion of *bhakti-rasa*, and therefore the view of SAstra must prevail.' [Pollock. 2005, 30] Besides dispute over the inclusion of *bhakti* as *rasa*, there had been the other dispute, relating to certain other emotions in *rasa*.

Srivatsa Anchala, came as an innovator in the time where literature was less daring.' in his *Kavya Amrita* he argued that there were only four *rasas*, *sringAra*, *vIra*, *hAsya*, and *adbhut*. and *karuNa rasa*, *raudra rasa*, *bhayAnaka rasa*, and *vIbhatsa rasa* should not be included because they were *amangalya rasa* and so should not be part of the universally accepted definition of *rasa*.'

Through above small sample ... we see how the texts and literature are analyzed compared and inferences made to link them in interpretation. The core purpose is candidly recorded in the quote that follows:

"The main point for us of this taxonomic dispute is the fact that, whereas thinkers such as RAMachandra and GuNachandra and Srivatsa and Siddhichandra grasped the classical doctrine of art was somehow no longer adequate to their thought world, they could not mount a critique that could make a difference. The last major thinker I am aware of who addresses the problem of *rasa*, GokulnAtha UpAdhyAya (1675) demonstrates full command of ancient tradition but only reports the controversies and does not weigh in on them ... however minor, we may find these disputes over the sources of poetry and *rasa*, along with the relationship of the literary work to social reality and the formation of moral subjectivities, the problem they raise for cultural theory are major ones, as comparison with contemporaneous Europe certifies. The parallels here, in both, intellectual style and substance, are striking and they help us begin to understand how differently India and Europe responded to similar conceptual challenges and how radically, after centuries of comparability, their intellectual histories diverged." [Pollock, 2005.31-32].

(5) Conclusion & Way Forward

I have tried to present some points in this paper which may, I hope, will help while preparing for *utter paksha*. We must thank Mr. Malhotra for having ignited minds through his [Malhotra.2011, 2014, 2016] and agitated the *Bharatiya* conscience. Some points on way forward, we must have our own research paradigm standardized and prefer cross-referencing within our system which will not only remove errors but also help maintain the consistency. We are weak in 'popularization' and dissemination of our facts and correct information. Equally important is the development of our own "Indian philology" methodologically, more justified and convincing than what we have been dealing with. I started thinking in this direction a few years back and in this context special mention is of Prof. Aklujkar, [Aklujkar, 1996,2003] which has laid the foundation for my forthcoming works. We must understand that Scholarship can be counteracted only through scholarship.

References:

- Aklujkar, Ashok. 2003. A different sociolinguistics for Brahmins, Buddhists, and Jains. Published in Contemporary Views on Indian Civilization, pp. 54-69. (ed) Bhu Dev Sharma, USA: WAVES, World Association for Vedic Studies, USA.
- Aklujkar, Ashok. 1996. "The Early History of Sanskrit as Supreme Language: Ideology and Status of Sanskrit: Contributions to the History of the Sanskrit Language. (ed.) Jan E.M. Houben, Leiden -New York - K ln: E.J. Brill.
- Atreya, B.L. 1949, An Essay on Indian Culture: Its Spiritual, Moral and Social Aspects. UNESCO/PHS/C.E/2 PARIS, 11 July 1949
- Balagangadhara, S.N. 2012. Reconceptualizing India Studies. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Balagangadhara, S.N. 2005. 'The Heathen in his Blindness...': Asia, the West and the Dynamic of the Religion. Delhi: Manohar. (First pub. 1994).
- Coomaraswamy, Ananda K.(1994) A New Approach to the Vedas: An Essay in Translation and Exegesis. Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi. ISBN 81-2150630-1, Originally published in 1933 by Luzac & Co. London.
- Dunkin, Jalki.2013.Colonialism and its Impact on India: A Critique of Pollock's Hypothesis. International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities <http://journal.tumkuruniversity.in/Vol. 2. Issue 1, June 2013, pp. 122-129> ISSN 2277 – 7997
- Jha. Avinash (...) Conceptualizing a Twenty-first Century Discipline: Notes on 'Liberation Philology', Google search. 282361896-Notes-on-Liberation-Philology, Google.
- Malhotra, Rajiv. 2016. The Defense for Sanskrit. Delhi: HarperCollins Publishers. India. ISBN: 978-93-5177-538-3  Infinity Foundation 2016
- Malhotra, Rajiv. 2014. Indra's Net. Delhi: HarperCollins Publishers. India. ISBN: 978-93-5136- 244-9  Infinity Foundation 2014
- Malhotra, Rajiv. 2013. Being Different. Delhi: HarperCollins Publishers. India. ISBN: 978-93- 5116-050-2 Infinity Foundation 2011,2013
- Malhotra, Rajiv, and Aravindan Neelakandan. 2011. Breaking India. Delhi: Amaryllis. ISBN: 978-81-910676-7-8.  Infinity Foundation 2011

Sati Shankar orcid.org/0000-0003-4638-1745	satigsf@gmail.com www.satishankar.in
Sheldon Pollock & the Sanskrit Knowledge System: Some observations	Unit- F Ver.- o : Date 02/ 06/2016
Draft version not to be quoted without permission	© Global Synergetic Foundation

- Pollock, Sheldon, 2014. Philology in three dimensions © 2014 Macmillan Publishers Ltd. 2040- 5960 postmedieval: a journal of medieval cultural studies Vol. 5, 4, 398–413 www.palgrave-journals.com/pmed/
- Pollock, S. 2011. Crisis in the Classics. *Social Research: An International Quarterly* 78(1):21– 48.
- Pollock, S. 2009. Future Philology? The Fate of a Soft Science in a Hard World. In *The Fate of the Disciplines*, eds. J. Chandler and A. Davidson. *Critical Inquiry* 35(4): 931–961.
- Pollock, Sheldon. 2006. *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men*. Berkeley: University of California Press. (2015) Published in India by Permanent Black, Ranikhet. ISBN 81- 7824-275-3. ©2006 The Regents of the University of California
- Pollock, Sheldon. 2005. The Ends of Man at the End of Premodernity. Twelfth Gonda Lecture, Dec.3rd, 2004, Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences. Amsterdam
- Pollock, Sheldon. 2004. "Forms of Knowledge in Early Modern South Asia: Introduction." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East*. 24 (2): 19-21.
- Pollock .1989. 'MimAnsA and the Problem of History in Traditional India.' *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 109,3:603-11
- Pollock, S.1998 a. " Bhija's SrīngAraprakāśa and the problem of rasa.' A historical Introduction and Translation,' *Asiatische Studien/Etudes asiatiques* 70,1117-92
- Sati Shankar. 2015 a, How can we trust someone who does not know who he or she is? Paper presented at the 19th WAVES-India Conference "Science and Spirituality in Vedic Traditions: Modern Context" Organized jointly by the Delhi Sanskrit Academy, and the WAVES-India. New Delhi. Nov 27-29th, 2015
- Sati Shankar. 2015. On Translation of Scriptures. <http://www.astitva.info/DIN2072000011>, July 6th, 2015. ISSN: 2454-602X, ©Global Synergetic Foundation
- SKS, 2013. "Sanskrit Knowledge Systems on the Eve of Colonialism," <http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pollock/sks/index.html> and (Accessed 24 July 2013).
- Turner, James. 2014. *Philology: The Forgotten Origins of the Modern Humanities*. Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2014. Pp. xxiv, 550. ISBN 9780691145648. Review: <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2015/2015-02-18.html>